APPEARANCES, CONTINUED GADSBY & HANNAH LLP 225 Franklin Street Boston, Massachusetts 02110 for the plaintiff in intervention Cappseals By: Daniel J. Kelly, Esq. Scott A. Silverman, Esq. CAROL LYNN SCOTT, CSR, RMR Official Court Reporter One Courthouse Way, Suite 7204 Boston, Massachusetts 02210 (617) 330-1377

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Have you worked out your dispute with respect to Judge O'Toole's order?

MR. KELLY: We have not, Your Honor. My name is Dan Kelly. I'm for the plaintiff --

THE COURT: Do you want to call it?

THE CLERK: I am going to call the case, Judge.

Civil action No. 04-10421, Healthy Solutions versus ITV Direct. Would counsel please identify themselves for the record.

MR. KELLY: My name is Dan Kelly, with Scott Silverman, from Gadsby. We represent Cappseals, the plaintiff in intervention.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Good morning, Your Honor. I am Becky Christensen. I represent Healthy Solutions, LLC, Health Solutions, Inc., Alex Guerrero, Mike Howell and Greg Geremesz, all defendants in the counterclaim.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. ROBERTSON: And Christopher Robertson, Seyfarth Shaw, for the plaintiff ITV Direct.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, how critical is this report? I mean, one path I can suggest is that we permit you to file a motion with Judge O'Toole and ask whether he will permit the distribution of the results of his order to

1 the parties in this case. 2 MR. KELLY: Well, let me explain why the report is critical. There were initially --3 THE COURT: No, how about that? I mean, I 4 5 will take your word for it. MR. KELLY: Judge, I have already talked to 6 7 the lawyer who represents the FTC, the lead attorney, a 8 Mr. Daniel Kaufman. I spoke to him yesterday. He said that 9 he had no objection to the release of the report and any of 10 the documents that have been produced by ITV in that matter. 11 THE COURT: No, but the order is Judge 12 O'Toole's. 13 MR. KELLY: That's correct, Judge. 14 THE COURT: So all you have to do is just file 15 a motion with Judge O'Toole, saying all that and ask him to 16 just issue an order releasing the confidentiality of the --17 relieving everybody from the confidentiality of his order. 18 And then I will allow the motion to produce. 19 MR. KELLY: We could go that route, Judge. 20 I'm not sure whether it's necessary. I am concerned about the delay associated with filing such --21 22 THE COURT: You could do it this afternoon. 23 mean, he is right here in the building. 24 I think it is presumptuous of me to issue an order 25 that may be deemed to contradict what he said.

5
MR. KELLY: I understand that, Judge. But the
Court is certainly within its rights to address the
supplementation of the initial disclosures, because it's not
just the report that we're requesting. We have not seen any
of the additional documents from the from ITV since the
initial disclosures back in February.
This case in large respects concern what they have
done with respect to the sale of these products that
originated with our client and any expenses or costs that
they incurred with respect to the sale of those products.
THE COURT: That is a different issue; isn't
i+2

MR. KELLY: It is a different issue but it is included within our motion, Judge.

THE COURT: Well, it may be but I am parsing it up. I am saying I am not going to do anything with respect to Judge O'Toole's order. I will let you try to have him release the confidentiality of it.

That may be an overabundance of caution on my part. But, anyway, that is the way it is.

As far as bringing up-to-date what is Rule 26 material, you have an obligation to bring that up-to-date.

MR. ROBERTSON: And we agree, Your Honor. What we have not agreed to produce are -- as part of the FTC, our clients have been required to prepare asset

disclosures and asset statements which have nothing to do with the liability or the merits claimed in this case. They have to do with potential recovery once they get a judgment.

And as we have cited in our briefing, asset disclosures, you know, is for after they get that judgment, not now. These are truly just asset documents. In their motion they don't hide the fact that that's what they are looking for. They are simply looking for documents that reflect where our assets are.

THE COURT: Doesn't that go towards damages?

MR. ROBERTSON: No, it doesn't --

THE COURT: Their assets -- excuse me.

MR. ROBERTSON: I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Their assets are probably affected by the profit picture.

MR. ROBERTSON: Well, no, it doesn't go to their claim. Their claim is that they shipped a certain amount of product to us. What happened to it afterwards is irrelevant on that issue.

Whether we have --

MR. KELLY: That is in regard to their claims,

Judge. They're claiming a host of setoff defenses based

upon all of these costs that they incurred, a fraudulent

misrepresentation by the party in the middle of this Healthy

Solutions. They're claiming that they don't have to pay us

anything because they've incurred all these damages and costs associated with producing this product. And that's one of the things that is in our motion.

They have never articulated exactly what their damages are as they're required to do in the initial disclosures, nor have they given us any documents which support their claim for damages. That's why it's relevant.

(Pause in proceedings.)

THE COURT: I think what he says is correct.

I think that you do have an obligation under Rule 26, if you have got a counterclaim of some sort, to set forth the basis for your assertion of financial loss.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: I don't disagree with that,
Your Honor, at all. What we produced is we produced all the
invoices, all those documents. We can certainly go back
through what we produced and see if there are other
documents.

What we have not agreed to produce are financial statements, individual and company financial statements that were prepared specifically for the Federal Trade Commission in connection with attempting to resolve that case with them.

THE COURT: All right. So what is wrong with that?

MR. KELLY: It's just not true, Judge. They

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

haven't produced any documents. I think my colleague will back me up. They only produced the bare minimum of documents associated with the sale by Healthy Solutions of these products that we manufacture. THE COURT: Why don't I do this, why don't I let you take a deposition of them with the authority to summons in whatever, a 30(b)(6). MR. KELLY: A custodian of record deposition? THE COURT: Yes. Bring it all in. And have somebody there that understands the numbers and get it that way if they don't want to give it to you the easy way. MR. ROBERTSON: And certainly if they get an order from O'Toole releasing the report, we will give them the report, which has all the data. I mean, I can tell you, I can tell them, I will tell you --THE COURT: Do you want to settle this? MR. ROBERTSON: Well, we'll talk about that in a minute. We have had those discussions, Your Honor. THE COURT: Why don't we talk about now. MR. ROBERTSON: Sure. MS. CHRISTENSEN: I've been the quiet one, Your Honor, for a reason, which is we've had some very --THE COURT: You are holding the money. (Laughter.) MS. CHRISTENSEN: Well, I wish we were. We

had some very productive settlement discussions just this morning. And we have agreements in principle but we could use the Court's assistance in making sure that we do this properly.

Here's the overall framework.

Mr. Robertson's client had received over 300,000 bottles of goods. Those were sold to Mr. Robertson's client by my clients.

Mr. Kelly represents the company that actually made this product and shipped it. My client and Mr. Kelly's clients have not been paid. Our claim is 1.8 million without interest. Theirs is \$890,000 plus, without interest or cost for fees and so forth.

My clients would like to move on with their lives and get out of the litigation. And so in principle we have agreed to allow the product supplier to enter judgment against us.

And then we have agreed in principle with Mr. Robertson who represents ITV Direct and Direct Fulfillment that we will release each other except to the extent that Healthy Solutions owes money to the supplier manufacturer of the goods.

THE COURT: Who is?

MR. KELLY: My client, Judge, Cappseals.

MS. CHRISTENSEN: Now, you say --

1 their claims against us but we would also retain our 2 affirmative defenses and rights of setoff. Basically that we would be able to make those defenses at any trial in this 3 action --4 5 THE COURT: You are just paring it down. 6 MR. ROBERTSON: Paring it down, yes. 7 THE COURT: That doesn't excite me, so I will 8 stick with you. You just lost my interest. 9 Why can't you settle the whole thing? 10 MR. ROBERTSON: Because we are still actively 11 engaged in litigation with the Federal Trade Commission who 12 in their view has determined that all of this money we are 13 fighting about is likely to go back to them. So we can't --14 THE COURT: Well, that is a different case. 15 Why doesn't that just go before --16 MR. ROBERTSON: Because we have an 17 indemnification agreement with her client that they're liable for any amounts that we ultimately have to pay. 18 And 19 so --20 MS. CHRISTENSEN: Your Honor, we don't agree 21 with that at all but we're willing to let it all go so that 22 my clients can move on with their lives and do business. 23 We have an indemnity action against his clients in 24 Judge O'Toole's court which is in the FTC action. 25 But the barrier for my client in settling simply

has to do with the existence of the court's injunction. And we want to be careful, and the three sets of attorneys are in agreement, that Cappseals' rights to bring its claims and ITV Direct's rights would not be impaired by letting us out. And that's where we need the Court's assistance, that we don't run afoul of the injunction that says that we can't compromise the only asset that we have, which is the receivable for over 1.8 million.

THE COURT: Well, as long as everybody agrees to it, I mean, I am not going to stand in your way.

What you have to do is to come up with an agreement for judgment that sets all of this down in some understandable way. And if you are looking for approval from me, I will approve it as long as everybody else is agreed to it.

MR. KELLY: We just don't want to interfere,

Judge, with our continued prosecution of these claims. We'd

like to get this discovery as you suggested completed as

soon as possible and a trial date so that we can go forward

on this.

THE COURT: Well, we can do that too. So there are two distinct features here.

One is some agreement you are going to enter into that pares down the issues.

And the second, the continuation of the discovery

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in what will be the remaining case regardless of what happens in this settlement agreement. And that requires you going to Judge O'Toole for permission to get the confidential order that results from his order, confidential material that results from his order and the deposition of the -- what is the name of your company again? MR. ROBERTSON: ITV. I would actually -- I'm sorry, Your Honor. THE COURT: Go ahead. MR. ROBERTSON: I was just going to propose if they want to submit written interrogatories to us, we can do it that way. THE COURT: Well, I think depositions are faster. MR. ROBERTSON: Okay. I would also just propose -- I think all the information they want is sitting in that report. And, again, O'Toole's finding --THE COURT: Well, if he gets -- maybe that is the thing to do. MR. ROBERTSON: Maybe just wait --THE COURT: Just go to Judge O'Toole first. He will give you the order. They get the report and then see if you need anything else. Maybe they don't. MR. ROBERTSON: If you want a deposition with the report --

MR. KELLY: Well, remember, we are talking 1 2 about not only what's in the report but we are talking about their damages here. We're required under the initial 3 4 disclosures --5 THE COURT: You may look at the report and say 6 I don't need anything else. You may look at the report and 7 say I still need to take the deposition, which I am giving 8 you permission to do. 9 MR. KELLY: Could we set a date for that, 10 Judge? 11 THE COURT: First of all, how much time Yes. 12 do you need to make the request to go to Judge O'Toole? 13 I assume we can do that within the MR. KELLY: 14 next two days. 15 All right. So let's say you will THE COURT: do that within the next 48 hours. 16 17 We can't say when he will respond. 18 MR. KELLY: May I ask some clarification? 19 it permissible, Judge, to represent to Judge O'Toole that 20 you would be willing to issue an order requiring the 21 production of the report, assuming we work out the issues 22 concerning confidentiality? 23 THE COURT: As long as he agrees. 24 MR. KELLY: Right. 25 THE COURT: All you have to do is just spend a

1 little money and Carol can type it up, this last portion, 2 and you can attach that to your motion. 3 MR. KELLY: Right. Just so I'm clear, the 4 Court's view is that the report is relevant. 5 permissible for us to --6 THE COURT: It might well be relevant. 7 don't even know what it says. But it is nothing as far as I am concerned. It is up to Judge O'Toole. If he says they 8 can get it, it is fine by me. They can look at it. 9 10 then you determine what relevance it has. I am not going to determine relevance in advance. 11 12 Then, in addition to that, so you are going to 13 accomplish that in two days. We will see when Judge O'Toole 14 gets back to you. 15 You then want to take this deposition. When do you want to take it? 16 17 MR. KELLY: Well, let me say, Judge, the 18 report is fine but we would like to have all of the 19 underlying data supporting the report. 20 THE COURT: Just --21 MR. KELLY: And there is no reason why they 22 can't produce that independent of our review of the report. 23 In other words, this report is based upon --24 THE COURT: Do you want to take your chances 25 on that? I am giving you a chance to summons it in and sit

1 there in the same office and have it handed to you. 2 When do you want to? So that is the course we will 3 If you do it voluntarily, then you don't need the follow. deposition. 4 5 When do you want to have the material available for 6 your deposition? 7 MR. KELLY: As soon as possible, Judge. 8 THE COURT: That doesn't help out. 9 MR. KELLY: Two weeks. 10 THE COURT: All right, two weeks. 11 MR. KELLY: And that deposition would not only 12 cover the material underlying their damages claim but it 13 would also require them to articulate what their damages 14 claim is pursuant to the initial disclosure rule. 15 THE COURT: Rule 26, right. 16 MR. KELLY: Right. 17 THE COURT: They have to meet the requirements 18 of Rule 26. Okay. My Rule 26 order. Okay. 19 All right. So we will issue an order memorializing 20 all this. And then we will bring you back, let's say sixty days from now, around then, to see what you have done to 21 each other and give you a trial date. 22 23 MR. KELLY: Judge, I would just as soon schedule, could we have a final pretrial conference on that 24 25 date so that we don't --

Yes, that is what I am doing. 1 THE COURT: 2 MR. KELLY: In other words, required within 3 the Court's rules, all of the things that are required before the submission, before the attendance of the final 4 pretrial conference on that date. In other words, the 5 6 identification of exhibits, of witnesses, I just want to get 7 to the end game. 8 THE COURT: Yes, we can do that. She will 9 send out an order requiring the names of the witnesses and 10 how much time each one will take. 11 MR. KELLY: Marking of exhibits. 12 THE COURT: Okav. 13 THE CLERK: April 5th for the pretrial. 14 MS. CHRISTENSEN: I'm sorry? 15 THE CLERK: April 5th, eleven o'clock. 16 MR. ROBERTSON: In the interim, Your Honor, we 17 will see if we can work out a document that articulates 18 where we are. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 MR. KELLY: Judge, should we wait until you --21 you just mentioned you are going to put together an order. Should we wait until we receive that before we go to Judge 22 23 O'Toole? 24 THE COURT: You can do that. They are pretty 25 good. They will have it out today.

CERTIFICATE

I, Carol Lynn Scott, Official Court Reporter for the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages are a true and accurate transcription of my shorthand notes taken in the aforementioned matter to the best of my skill and ability.

CAROL LYNN SCOTT Official Court Reporter John J. Moakley Courthouse 1 Courthouse Way, Suite 7204 Boston, Massachusetts 02210 (617) 330-1377